

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION.**

WRIT PETITION NO.4266 OF 2000

Amit Shridar, .. Petitioner

Vs

1. State of Maharashtra and ors. .. Respondents

Ms Madhavi Tavanandi, for the petitioner.(Absent)

Shri S.R.Nargolkar, AGP for the State.

CORAM : V.G.PALSHIKAR & D.B.BHOSALE, JJ.

DATE : 18th August, 2005.

PC:

1. Heard Mr Nargolkar, learned AGP for the respondent-State.

2. By this petition, the following prayers are made.

(a) that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to issue writ of certiorari or writ in the nature of certiorari, order or direction and call for all the record and proceedings of the record of the candidates admitted under Rule 3.3 and on examining and perusing the same, be

pleased to quash and set aside those admissions which have been granted without verifying the authentication/validity of the certificates of disability;

(b) that pending hearing and final disposal of this petition, this Hon'ble Court be pleased to stay the further admission process scheduled to start on the 8.8.2000 that has been now postponed, wherein balance seats of PH I & PH II category will be dereserved and offered to the open category and that inspection of all the documents pertaining to admission under Rule 3.3 be granted;

(c) that pending hearing and final disposal of this writ petition, this Hon'ble court be pleased to grant inspection of all the documents pertaining to admissions under Rule 3.3;

(d) that this Hon'ble High Court be pleased to issue writ of Mandamus or any other writ in the nature of Mandamus and direct the respondents to offer 3 percent seats to Physically Handicapped (PH) category;

(e) that pending hearing and final disposal of this petition, this Hon'ble High Court be pleased to direct the respondents to accommodate the petitioner in the balance seats of the PH I & PH II category;

(e) that interim reliefs as per prayer clauses "b,c and e" above be granted;

(f) that costs incidental to this petition be awarded to the petitioner; and

(g) that such and further order as may be deemed fit and proper be passed.

3. Looking to the prayers, it is obvious that after lapse of five years, the admission granted five years ago need not be quashed. Hence, the writ petition is dismissed. Rule discharged.

(D.B.BHOSALE, J.)

(V.G.PALSHIKAR, J.)